Universal Grammar

Thursday, June 27, 2024

There are those who claim theories about Universal Grammar, however, anyone capable of the least bit of reflection would hardly refrain from laughing that something which is being claimed to be universal is also theoretical. Universal Grammar would have to be something we are all familiar with, but have never had the wit to comprehend.

Language is Universal and Intelligible. As a species evolves, it starts to become linguistically capable. By all accounts, Language skills would not be possible for any species unless language were Universal and Intelligible. Effect always proceeds from cause. Grammar, on the other hand, is Particular and Perceptible. Grammar systems are expressed commensurately with the level of intelligence a species possesses. Ultimately, one should realize, as Plato did, but which wholly escapes the very much less intelligent, that Psychology is commensurate with the principles of Language which are functionally resident in the mind as grammar systems.

It is also not a theory that all around the globe today, computers are processing all information using simple binary recursion, or what Plato called dialectic, speech in accordance with the two parts of a thing, relative and correlative. Thus, if one knows that we virtualize things in the mind which allows us to manage actual perceptible things, that Language is derived from the intelligible of a thing, while Grammar is express from some perceptible of a thing. As the computer testifies, and as Plato also repeatedly expressed, a thing is defined by its two parts, commonly understood as the parsing of information, or as the parsing of a relative producing things. Thus, nouns are names for parsing boundaries, or again shape and form, while verbs are names of relatives, or in a tautology, relative differences.

There are two sources claiming that one day mankind would eventually learn Universal Grammar, one source is considered religious and the other scientific. These two sources, the Judeo-Christian Scripture and the dialogs of Plato. Both of them also point to one system of perceptible grammar.

As even the stupid computer points to the fact that there are two, and only two, parts of speech then how many categories of perceptible grammar systems are there? Every grammar is also composed of just two parts, symbol sets and methods of recursively using them to produce the two categories of names to make things and we make things, in case you missed it, by parsing relatives. Nothing, absolutely nothing, theoretical about it. We have, by simple multiplication, four categories of grammar known as a Grammar Matrix; Common Grammar, Arithmetic Grammar, Algebraic Grammar, and Geometric Grammar. Common Grammar is primarily relative, Arithmetic absolute, Algebraic a combination of the previous two, while Geometry is founded on an arithmetic identity of the behavior of the hand with the two elements of a thing.

This makes it wholly metaphorical, and wholly dependent upon one's intelligence to learn from it.

We have two, and only two parts of speech, so who, but a complete fool, spends their life writing mountains of gibberish about them, claiming this gibberish is some venerable theory? Worse yet, who but a complete moron claims that any truth whatsoever, is determined by some convoluted theory, instead of binary recursion, which, if you get down to it, is no more than counting?

Now, you can argue with the Bible, and you can argue with Plato, but now you have to argue with the computer which, I might add, controls your paycheck. You can be a sycophant of the Einstein's and Chomsky's pathetic dribble, or you can learn, as both the Bible and Plato inform you, right from your own hand all the principles of grammar and truth using simple Geometry.

Now, speaking about intelligence, how many geometry books have you ever seen, which can show you how simple it is to perform all of the operations called mathematical, all the methods, by simple demonstration, of data management in a wholly metaphorical display which, one will not comprehend until they use the logical grammars to point out what the figure is doing? Only Geometry.

Right before your eyes, during this little essay, you have seen geometry demonstrate the very foundation of every grammar possible. Now, what is not Universal about that? And if you feel impelled to write theories about a one-to-one correspondence between the two-elements of a thing, and your own hand, there will be plenty of intelligent people willing to feel sympathy for you, for as Plato noted, nothing can be predicated of our two elements, for they are the foundation of all naming conventions: So much for theories by the witless; no name can define itself and no convention of names can produce a theory of itself. Grammatical competence is wholly determined by the elements of a thing, and the intelligence to effect simply binary recursion.

In order to demonstrate Geometric Grammar, I had to do what no one else had ever done, demonstrate how to write arithmetic and algebraic equations directly parallel to Geometric Grammar. Instead of plotting points, I let that equation directly produce the graphs of the equations.